DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 209 385 UD 021 737

TITLE Law and the Adminstration of Justice. Final Report.
INSTITUTION Chicago Board of Education, Ill. Dept. of Research and Evaluation.
PUB DATE Jul 80
NOTE 32p.; Deletions have been made after p27 because of poor quality and superfluous material.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Courts; Federal Programs; High Schools; *Legal Education; *Measurement Techniques; Program Descriptions; Program Evaluation; *Program Validation; Urban Education
IDENTIFIERS *Chicago Public Schools IL; Elementary Secondary Education Act Title IV

ABSTRACT

"Law and the Adminstration of Justice" is a Title IVc three-year project funded by the Federal government and coordinated by the Board of Education, City of Chicago. The overall goal of the project was to provide high school students with an opportunity to learn about and be involved with various aspects of our judicial system. The project offered a diverse set of learning experiences, ranging from in-class instruction to student directed workshops and seminars. While pre- and posttest and student survey data reveal statistically significant results favoring the project, the various instruments used to measure cognitive and affective dimensions proved to be defective. Consequently, the Title IVc project could not be properly validated. (Author/APM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED209383

"Law and the Administration of Justice"

Final Report

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Frederick A. Schuster
Chicago Bd. of Ed.
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Submitted by:

Department of Research, Evaluation and Long Range Planning

July 1980

UD021737

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary ..... Page 1

Report 1979-80 ..... Page 2

Appendix A
Validation application ..... Page 7

Appendix B
Memo to Project Coordinator ..... Page 54

Appendix C
Memo to:
Research and Evaluation ..... Page 57

Appendix D
Copy of Release ..... Page 63

BOARD OF EDUCATION CITY OF CHICAGO

Kenneth B. Smith, President

Sol Brandzel
Edwin Claudio
Leon Davis
John D. Foster
Joyce A. Hughes
Martha J. Jantho
Wilfred Reid
Luis Salces
Michael W. Scott
Raul Villalobos

Angeline P. Caruso
Interim General Superintendent of Schools

"Law and the Administration of Justice"

Executive Summary

"Law and the Administration of Justice" is a Title IVc three-year project funded by the federal government and coordinated by the Board of Education, City of Chicago. The overall goal of the project was to provide high school students with an opportunity to learn about and be involved with various aspects of our judicial system. The project provided a diverse set of learning experiences ranging from in-class instruction to student directed workshops and seminars. While the data reveal statistically significant results favoring the project, the various instruments used to measure cognitive and affective dimensions proved to be defective. Consequently, the Title IVc project could not be validated as originally planned.

Introduction

The 1979-80 school year represents the final year of a three-year grant for the project titled "Law and the Administration of Justice." The program is located at Lincoln Park High School in District #3 of the Board of Education, City of Chicago and is funded, in part, through the Title IVc program administered by the State of Illinois. The project is characterized as attempting to provide an educational experience for students at the high school level focusing on laws of our society and how these laws are administered through the police, legal and court systems. The program is offered as an elective course with approximately 65 students involved during the present year.

Background

Year One: With the onset of the school year 1977-78, the project begun with efforts directed toward development of course materials and the selection of various measurement tools. An evaluator was contracted to perform the evaluation on the project in May of that school year. At the conclusion of the first year, the cognitive tests were discarded in favor of a different group of tests measuring the knowledge of students enrolled in the program.

Year Two: The project was in full operation with the various measurement instruments in place. Substantial amounts of data were gathered during the year in an effort to present a substantive argument that the project is producing the learnings which are stated in the objectives for the program.

Year Three: During the summer preceeding the 1979-80 school year, a new evaluator was hired in an effort to build a substantial case for validation. In particular, the desire was to present a document to the State of Illinois showing program effectiveness.

Program Validation

During early fall 1979, the evaluator performed the analysis of all data available to him from year two (year on which validation is based) and, in turn, to write the necessary report using the specified format from the State of Illinois. The report contained the narrative along with the results of data processing from the following instruments:

Basic Law Knowledge Test

(Criminal and Civil Justice subtests)

Survey Questionnaire

Semantic Differential

The program evaluator submitted the document to the Board of Educatio., City of Chicago, which forwarded the document to the state following the necessary approvals. Appendix A contains a copy of the validation application which was forwarded to the State of Illinois.

The Project Coordinator received a response from the state that the validation application needed revisions to improve the analyses of the data (12-14-80). Specifically, the state suggested that the analyses include a more thorough investigation of the cognitive tests and to delete the instrumentation involving the affective domain since the results from the semantic differential showed insignificant findings. In response to the state suggestion, the evaluator investigated the tests more thoroughly and on January 23, 1980, prepared a memorandum to the Project Coordinator recommending that the project not attempt a re-

application for validation process. The data from the project had serious technical flaws and, hence, the project was incapable of establishing that the gains in cognitive knowledge were attributable to the program treatment. A copy of the memo to the Project Coordinator is presented in Appendix B of this document.

The Department of Research and Evaluation, Board of Education, City of Chicago requested the evaluator to complete additional analyses on the data in an effort to detect possible ways in which the data might demonstrate program successes. In response to this directive, and following a more detailed analysis, the evaluator prepared a memorandum to Dr. Mueller, Research and Evaluation, Board of Education, City of Chicago, identifying the statistical procedures performed on the data and the conclusions available from the results. Again, the evaluator recommended not to apply for validation due to the seriously flawed data. A copy of the memo to Dr. Mueller is located in Appendix C of this report.

At the insistance of the Constitutional Rights Foundation, Chicago Office, all original data and related papers were released to the foundation by the evaluator. It is the evaluator's understanding that the Foundation was intending to reanalyze the data and to prepare the reapplication for the validation. Evidentally, the Constitutional Rights Foundation, Chicago Office was not successful in achieveing their goal. Due to the fact that evaluators for projects coordinated by the Board of Education, City of Chicago, are responsible for the original data and related documents for a period of five years, the present evaluator required the Constitutional Rights Foundation, Chicago Office, to sign a release of liability. A copy of the release with a listing of documents given the Foundation is located in Appendix D of this report.

1979-80 End of Year Results

On May 7 and 15, 1980, the evaluator contacted the Assistant Principal at Lincoln Park High School to obtain all data from the year in order to perform the necessary end-of-year analyses. Since the final test of the cognitive knowledge was not given until the last week of school, the evaluator was not able to obtain the data until after June 26th. All data were obtained on June 27, 1980. Included was:

A. Posttests of the Basic Law Knowledge for control and treatment groups.

B. Posttest versions of the "Survey Questionnaire" for the treatment and control groups.

C. Posttest versions of the "Opinionnaire about Social Problems."

D. Posttest versions of the "Orientation Inventory."

The evaluator notes that none of the pretest data were available since these data were and continued to be in the possession of the Constitutional Rights Foundation, Chicago Office. Further, please note that only the posttests of the Basic Law knowledge tests were graded. Therefore, the evaluator can only report the results from his analyses of the cognitive tests (Criminal Justice and Civil Justice subtests).

Each of the post subtests for both the treatment and control groups were analyzed using the validated test items based on the item analysis performed mid-year. Specifically, 21 items (from 32 originally) on the Criminal Justice test and 11 items (from 36 originally) on the Civil Justice test were used as the basis for the statistical procedures. The raw scores correct were converted to percent correct and subsequently analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social

Sciences (Version H, Release 8.0). The statistics derived from the initial analyses are located in Table 1.

	Criminal Justice		Civil Justice	
	Treatment	Control	Treatment	Control
Mean**	52.2%	34.8%*	70.4%	46.8%*
Standard deviation	17.8%	15.7%	13.0%	15.4%
Range	85%	70%	57.1%	76.2%
N	62	41	62	41

*Significantly lower than treatment group
**Percent correct

Table 1: Summary data from Basic Law Knowledge Test

A t-test was used to compare the differences between the means of the treatment and control groups for each of the two tests which form the Basic Law Knowledge test. The results reveal that the differences are real with the probability for error at a level of less than .001. Clearly, the students in the program were able to answer more questions correctly than those in the control group. However, it must be noted that the mean percent correct for the treatment group is 52.2% and 70.4% on the Criminal Justice and Civil Justice tests, respectively.

Comparing these results with those from last year, it is observed that the treatment group achieved 54.7% and 66.6% for the Criminal Justice and Civil Justice tests, respectively. The scores for last

year and for this year appear to be fairly consistent. That is, the students seem to have a better grasp of Civil justice than Criminal justice.

Although the pretest scores for the present year are not available to the evaluator, it is assumed that there is a statistically significant difference between the pretest and posttest performance. This assumption is based on the similarity of student performance between last year and this year. Last year, it was found that there was a statistically significant difference between the pretest and posttest results. However, it must be mentioned that the tests used for pretesting were different than those used for posttesting. Consequently, it is not clear exactly what was being measured by the two different tests

Summary.

During the present year, the evaluator attempted to establish the fact that the program titled "Law and the Administration of Justice" was significant and valid. Unfortunately, the data gathering and the type of data gathered recommended by the previous evaluator proved to be fatal to the project. The present evaluator attempted to prepare a validation application; however, the application was returned from the state for reasons explained elsewhere in this final report. Following a more thorough investigation of the data, the evaluator found that the data were too seriously flawed to merit an attempt to reapply for validation. Clearly, the data that are available does show real learnings by students enrolled in the program. When compared with a control group, the treatment group demonstrated statistically significant learnings. Finally, this report presents the analysis of data for the end of the year as well as the final report for the project.

APPENDIX A
Validation Application

PROJECT INFORMATION

Area of Concern:	Responsibility and law focused education
Project Title:	Law and the Administration of Justice
Project Director's Name:	Phyllis Wright Lincoln Park High School 2039 North Orchard Street Chicago, Illinois 60614
Phone Number:	312-787-6830
Application Agency:	Board of Education City of Chicago District 299 228 North La Salle Chicago, Ill. 60601
Superintendent's Name:	Dr. Joseph Hannon Board of Education City of Chicago 228 North La Salle Chicago, Illinois 60601
Phone Number:	312-641-4141
Project Period:	Beginning September 1977 Ending June 1980

Expenditures Grant Period	Federal Funds	Total Funds
1977 - 1978	25,746	25,746
1978 - 1979	31,157	31,157
1979 - 1980	37,425	37,425
TOTAL	94,328	94,328

ABSTRACT

Students enrolled in two classes (experimental and control) titled Law and American Society were studied to assess whether or not there were significant gains in knowledge as a result of treatment. These students enrolled in an urban high school were also studied to detect whether or not there were any significant changes in attitude as a result of treatment.

The data did show significantly different results between the control and experimental groups. Specifically, the experimental group showed higher gains in knowledge than the control group. Therefore, the first of the two objectives was met.

The second objective was related to the experimental group showing significantly more positive attitudes than the control groups toward law and enforcement. No significant differences were detected with various contrasts between groups. However, a strong sex-treatment interaction did occur. The males tended to remain stable in their attitudes regardless of group assignment. The females, on the other hand, showed significant changes in more positive directions. One possible explanation is that males in high school established their point of view and it is resistant to change. Females, on the other hand, apparently have a more "openmind" toward law and enforcement. As a result of the treatment (completion of course) they tended to formulate a more definite opinion. For example, the females tended to become more positive toward: Laws, Courts, Judges, and Police Officers.

A. PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES

1. Major purpose of program: The program is intended to increase the knowledge of students and improve their attitudes toward law and processes of justice in the American Society.

2. Objectives of the program:

Objective A: Students in grades 10, 11, and 12, enrolled in the Law in American Society classes at Lincoln Park High School after 37 weeks of treatment will increase their knowledge significantly ($p<.05$) when compared with the control group as ascertained by a pre-and posttest of The Basic Law Knowledge test.

Objective B: Students in grades 10, 11, and 12, enrolled in the Law in American Society classes at Lincoln Park High School after 37 weeks of treatment will demonstrate a significantly more ($p<.05$) positive attitude toward law and enforcement compared to the control group as ascertained by a pre-and posttest administration of a semantic differential (Survey Questionnaire).

3. Identify how much change in behavior:

Stated in above item - A:2.

4. Inter-relationships among objectives:

The objectives are considered equally important because of the nature of the program impacting both the knowledge and attitudes.

5. Changes in Objectives:

There were no changes in the intent of the objectives, however, the current year has an additional instrument included to detect changes

in the attitudes of the target audience. Results will be shared with visiting team.

B. PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

1. Describe the process(es) including each key element such as:

A. What the learner did differently.

In addition to teacher-based instruction, students participated in the following activities.

1. Ten (Monthly) Student Workshops-these were inter or intra-school.

2. Classes in which guest resource persons, i.e., judges; lawyers; law enforcement officers-city, county, state, federal; probation officers; representatives from local community organization, governmental officers; paralegal fields and the business community were used extensively.

3. Field Experiences to: Juvenile Detention Center, court systems, local police stations, community and law-related agencies.

4. Development of Learning Packets-Students prepared learning packets based on their class work and participation at workshops and conferences.

5. Peer Teaching - After developing learning packets or attending workshops, students scheduled peer teaching activities for other social studies classes in their local high schools.

6. Cross-Age Teaching - Learning packets were used by the students in the local elementary schools.

7. Students planned, organized and facilitated: Mock trials, law week activities, leadership conferences, workshops for adults in which they used a variety of teaching techniques-role playing, simulation games, resource person expertise, etc.

8. Students attended local school and community meetings and formed a student action group to assist in positive community projects.

9. Students contacted, interviewed, and surveyed adults and other students concerning legal issues.

10. Students analyzed current legal issues and produced a law-related publication.

B. The teacher should be a highly motivated social studies major. While a background in political science and law is helpful, a one week inservice session is sufficient for using the suggested content and materials if the teacher is committed to law and responsibility education.

The teacher was responsible for assisting students in:

1. Developing confidence in themselves in preparing for leadership roles.

2. Developing skills in the areas of: surveying techniques, role playing, using simulation games, preparing written and oral law-related materials.

3. Planning a variety of large and small group projects and experiences as well as individual ones.

4. Coordinating in-school and outside activities.

5. Finding and contacting necessary resource persons to be utilized during the year.

6. Working with other school classes and classes within the school, i.e., art class, computer class, film study class.

C. The basic materials used in the course were developed by the Constitutional Rights Foundation and are available from Scholastic Book Services. Many of the teaching techniques and strategies used in the course are available from the Constitutional Rights Foundation. The Learning Packets and Workshop Packets will be available from the Law and the Administration of Justice program. Other supplementary material are listed in another section of the report.

D. Additional coordinating time and/or clerical assistance for the teacher (5 periods per week) would be advisable to fully implement workshops and field experiences.

E. It should be noted that while the class is traditional 40 min. per day for the school year, it is advisable that the school allow flexibility in scheduling to facilitate workshop and field experience scheduling.

F. Parent and/or community involvement is helpful since these groups may provide assistance and resources. Parents may assist with field experiences and may often serve as resource persons. Community cooperation has been found to be beneficial to both students

and adults involved since we are striving for mutual cooperation to solve community problems through participation.

A listing of curricular materials used in this program as well as a listing of student produced materials exist in Appendix A.

C. EVALUATION DESIGN

1. The design: The design for the evaluation consisted of a quasi-experimental approach (Design 10, Campbell and Stanley) having the following configuartion:

O	X	O	Experimental Group
O	X	O	Control Group

Specifically, the students participating in the program (experimental and control group) consisted of a self-selected group of students in the fact that they enrolled in an elective course at the high school. The placement of the students in one or the other sections of the elective course were largely determined by scheduling procedures used within the school system. Placement was achieved through a semi-random assignment given schedule conflicts. At the beginning of the program, the students in both groups were given a pretest for both law knowledge and assessment of existing attitudes. Since there were no statistically significant differences between the experimental and control groups, the assumption is made that both groups were comparable at the beginnin of the study. The results of this program are believed to be attributable to program effects for this particular high school.

2. Instrumentation:

Objective A: The Basic Law Knowledge Test: The Basic Law Knowledge Test is copyrighted by Scholastic Book Services based on materials designed and developed by the Constitutional Rights Foundation and Scholastic Book Services during the past few years.

Further, the instrument was submitted to a number of reputable law firms in the Metropolitan Chicago area for scrutiny (results on file in project office). As a result, the Basic Law Knowledge Test is judged as having content validity. At the time of team visitation, reliability estimates will be available based on split-half procedures.

Objective B: Semantic Differential: The semantic differential (Survey Questionnaire) used for the Law and the Administration of Justice program had its beginning with the parent project in Los Angles known as "Youth and the Administration of Justice" (Constitutional Rights Foundations, Los Angles). The parent instrument was titled "Student Attitude Assessment Instrument" (SAA). The SAA was reduced in size and revised by the L.A. project to produce the instrument used for the present project. No reliability or validity information exists, however, the current version is sensitive for detecting shifts.

A semantic differential utilized to detect attitude shifts associated with program effects. Basically, the instrument uses a single concept followed by a series of bi-polar adjectives. As an illustration, the student responds to the concept of "laws" by placing a mark between the adjectives "good" and "bad". The face validity of the instrumentation is certainly high although no supportive data exist to document this specific point. Reliability of this instrument (constructed for this particular application) is unknown.

3. Data gathering: See Chart A.

CHART A
Record of Data Collection and Analysis

OBJECTIVE	EVALUATION INSTRUMENT	DATA COLLECTION			DATA ANALYSIS	
		COLLECTED ON WHOM	WHEN COLLECTED	COLLECTED BY WHOM	HOW ANALYZED	ANALYSIS RESULTS
Objective A: Students in grades 10, 11, and 12 enrolled in the Law in American Society classes at Lincoln Park High School after 37 weeks of treatment will increase their knowledge significantly ($p < .05$) when compared with the control group as ascertained by a pre and post test of the Basic Law Knowledge Test.	The Basic Law Knowledge Test	Experimental and Control groups	9/77 and 5/78 9/78 and 5/79	Project Director	t-test	Significant at $p < .05$ Significant at $p < .05$
Objective B: Students in grades 10, 11, and 12 enrolled in the Law in American Society classes at Lincoln Park High School after 37 weeks of treatment will demonstrate a significantly more ($p < .5$) positive attitude toward law and enforcement compared with the control group as ascertained by a pre and post test administration of a semantic differential (Survey Questionnaire).	Survey Questionnaire	Experimental and Control groups	9/77 and 5/78 9/78 and 5/79	Project Director	t-test	Selected significance at $p < .05$ (see text) Selected significance at $p < .05$ (see text)

C. The results from the preceeding year show similar gains. More specifically, pre/post gain for the experimental group was significant at the .01 level. Therefore, the knowledge gained as a result of this project realizes significant changes. (Source: Evaluation Report for 1978/790.

Objective B: Students in grades 10, 11, and 12, enrolled in the Law in American Society classes at Lincoln Park High School after 37 weeks of treatment will demonstrate a significantly more ($p<.05$) positive attitude toward law and enforcement compared to the control group as ascertained by a pre-and posttest administration of a semamtic differential (Survey Questionnaire).

In order to detect changes in attitudes, the results of the pre- and posttest administration of the semantic differential were analyzed in several ways. To derive the raw data for the analysis, each test was scored in the following manner:

A. There were twelve dimensions on the instrument,

B. Each dimension has nine pairs of bi-polar adjectives,

C. Each pair of bi-polar adjectives had six blanks with the most desired response assigned a value of six,

D. Therefore, each dimension could have as high as 54 points, and

E. The dimensions studied were: Laws, Crime, Courts, Judges, Attorneys, Police Officers, Criminals, Parole Officers, Yourself, Justice in America, your community, and your school.

The contrasts for the analysis consisted of comparing the pre-and post mean scores for each dimension for the control and experimental groups. This detected pre/post changes within groups. The third contrast is the comparison between the two groups on the pretest and,

the fourth contrast was the comparison between the two groups on the posttest.

Contrast One: Comparison of pre-and posttest mean scores for control groups.

Results: There were three dimensions which showed significant changes

Yourself:

Pre	40.8	Significantly (.001)	more positive
Post	49.3		

Your Community:

Pre	40.2	Significantly (.007)	less positive
Post	33.4		

Your School:

Pre	48.9	Significantly (.001)	less positive
Post	39.3		

Comment: The students did enroll in a class with the same title but the content and pedagogy were different. Therefore, some changes were anticipated. These changes were not about law and enforcement but rather, about self-concept.

Contrast Two: Comparison of pre and post mean score for experimental group.

Results: There were seven dimensions which showed significant changes:

Crime:

Pre	46.3	Significantly (.001)	less positive
Post	43.4		

Police Officers:

Pre	34.2	Significantly (.001)	more positive
Post	37.6		

Parole Officers:

Pre	34.3	Significantly (.001)	more positive
Post	41.1		

Yourself:

Pre	41.3	Significantly (.001)	more positive
Post	48.3		

Justice in America:

Pre	43.4	Significantly (.025)	less positive
Post	40.9		

Your Community:

Pre	40.9	Significantly (.001)	less positive
Post	35.5		

Your School:

Pre	47.8	Significantly (.001)	less positive
Post	42.4		

Comment: Clearly, the treatment group resulted with greater numbers of significant changes when compared with the control group. Four dimensions became more negative while three showed more positive shifts. Interestingly, the pattern of changes shared by both groups were similar. That is, the dimension "yourself" became more positive for both while "your community" and "your school" shifted to more negative positions. Most important, however, were the profound changes toward crime (less positive) police officers (more positive) parole officers (more positive), and Justice in America (less positive).

Contrast Three: Comparison between control group and experimental group on pre-test.

Result: One contrast appeared significant at the ($p<.05$) dimension titled "Justice in America." All others were not significant.

Experimental	43.4	sig. .05
Control	40.5	

Contrast Four: Comparison between control group and experimental group on posttest.

Result: No contrasts resulted in significant differences.

In light of the surprising lack of differences between the control and experimental group contrasts on the posttest, a further investigation was undertaken to detect sex differences within the experimental group. The dimensions showing significant shifts are reported below:

D. RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

Objective A: Students in grades 10, 11, and 12 enrolled in the Law in American Society classes at Lincoln Park High School after 37 weeks of treatment will increase their knowledge significantly ($p<.05$) when compared with the control group as ascertained by a pretest and posttest of the Basic Law Knowledge Test.

A. The Basic Law Knowledge Test was administered as a posttest instrument in May 1979, to both the experimental and control groups.

RESULTS:

Pretest Exp. Group	N=72	Mean=29.14	S.D.=2.21
Posttest Exp. Group	N=70	Mean=49.63	S.D.=7.93

CONCLUSION:

Statistically significant differences exists, therefore, it is concluded that the program did realize a significantly greater increase in knowledge compared with the control group. It should be noted that the control group participated in a traditionally taught course with the same title therefore, the control group should experience a gain, too.

B. The Basic Law Knowledge Test was administered as a pretest instrument in September 1978, to both the experimental and control groups.

RESULTS:

Exp. Group	N=72	Mean=29.14	S.D. = 2.21
Control Group	N=46	Mean=29.35	S.D. = 2.21

CONCLUSION:

No significant differences exist therefore, it is concluded that groups are comparable.

Dimension - Law:

	Pre	Post	
males	44.0	43.9	not significant
females	39.4	41.7	

Dimension - Courts:

males	43.0	44.9	not significant
females	41.1	41.1	

Dimension - Judges:

males	43.6	42.6
females	38.3	40.6
	significant	not significant

Dimension - Police Officers:

males	37.5	38.9
females	32.1	36.7
	significant	not significant

Dimension - Criminals:

males	44.4	42.2
females	37.6	42.6
	significant	not significant

Dimension - Yourself:

males	45.5	47.9
females	38.8	48.5
	significant	not significant

Dimension - Your Community:

males	44.0	38.4
females	39.1	38.6
	significant	not significant

The above results show some interesting trends. From among the seven significantly different sex difference contrasts and other data, the following observations are made:

A. Six of the seven contrasts for males show a stable attitude toward the dimensions studied. In addition, the remaining dimensions (showing no sex differences) yield the same stable condition. Only "Your Community" resulted in a significant shift that was more negative and which could be interpreted as more neutral or uncertain.

B. Females appear to be susceptible to treatment effects. That is, they change their attitudes to a more firm point of view rather dramatically on several of the dimensions. Evidently, the results for the experimental group pre-post contrasts are largely attributable to female attitude changes rather than male attitude changes.

C. On nearly all dimensions, the females tended to change toward the direction represented by the males.

D. Reviewing the control group data for sex difference contrasts, only one dimension appears significant (Parole Officers). That is, the females tended to have a more definite position on the posttest (males-37.1, females-42.6), however, both sexes moved in the same direction (more positive).

E. The sex of the experimental group teacher was female while the control group teacher was male.

General summary:

There were no significant changes in attitudes between the experimental and control group on the posttest. However, the changes within group (experimental and control) revealed some differences. That is, there were three significant changes within the control group while the experimental group showed seven significant changes.

The most stunning result shows a potential profound sex treatment interaction. The females made rather dramatic changes in the experimental group while the males in the experimental group tended to remain stable over time. Further, the females tended to move toward the position held by the males. One hypothesis related to this phenomenon is that the females tended to be more neutral at the beginning of the course. By the conclusion of the course, they held more definite positions. Perhaps, they were more "open-minded" than the males. Another hypothesis is that the males had more contact with police and courts (or, knew of cases closely associated with friends)

and established a definite, unyielding point of view prior to the course.

Finally, a confounding factor may be the sex of the teachers in the control and experimental groups. Specifically, the effects on the experimental group may have been due to the female teacher establishing an identity for the female students. Nevertheless, a strong sex-treatment interaction did appear, possibly leading toward the conclusion that females respond best to this course in terms of attitude changes.

EXPORTABILITY

Education Significance

The Law and the Administration of Justice program responds to a most critical and pressing need in American society. Law has become an increasingly complex and pervasive instrument. Yet, it is estimated by the Study Group of Law-related Education, published by the U.S. Office of Education, September 1, 1978, that probably no more than 10 percent of elementary and secondary school students receive any law-related education. Numerous other studies including a national survey of public attitudes conducted by Yankelovich, Skelly and White, Inc. and the second National Assessment of Citizenship and Social Studies indicate an evident deterioration of attitudes by young adults toward the legal system and an inadequate knowledge of law and lack of political participation.

The Chicago Project has been successful in demonstrating substantive gains in knowledge and an unusually high level of student participation and involvement in school and community affairs. (Add attitudinal change if we have one)! The program is now being used at Corliss High School in Chicago and while post testing will not be complete until June, 1980 indications are that the teacher and students are very positive about the course of study.

Law education should be recognized as an intergral part of each person's basic education for becoming a knowledgeable and responsible citizen and this program is designed to assist schools in meeting the needs expressed herein.

Target Population

It is anticipated that the program will function successfully in any community regardless of size and population since all areas have law enforcement and related governmental agencies in addition to school and community resource organizations.

Since the project is law-related responsive to a pluralistic community, and flexible in approach. The target population may be junior or senior high school students. Further, it is suitable for community or adult education programs.

Minimum Adoption or Replication

The adopter school any choose to utilize one or more of the following program units:

10 Weeks - Juvenile Rights and Responsibilities

20 Weeks - Criminal Law

10 Weeks - Civil Law

The teacher and students will be expected to meet the program objectives by demonstrating the use of program strategies and techniques to include:

1. Use of program materials as demonstrated during inservice. training to include small-group work, role playing and simulations.
2. Implementation of program components.
   A. Workshops - Intra or inter-school.
   B. Peer and/or Cross-Age Teaching.
   C. Field experiences to legal, governmental and community agencies.

D. Use of available community resource persons.

E. Student participation in community and governmental affairs.

Staffing and Training Requirements

The most essential requirements for a successful program would include:

1. A highly motivated and self-directed social studies department staff member.

2. A five-day inservice training to familiarize the teacher with the program components, course contents, materials and teaching strategies and techniques.

The training sessions may be given on five consecutive days during summer, winter, or spring holidays or may include an initial two-day inservice to cover teaching strategies and techniques and program components and three additional days to coincide with the units of study.

Materials, equipment, facilities

While no special equipment of facilities other than what is normally part of a school setting is needed, it is recommended that the classroom have moveable desks.

Basic Program Materials:

The Living Law: Criminal Justice and Civil Justice Scholastic Book Services

Ditto Masters, Teachers Guides and Manual, including Activities Booklets and Tests.

"Youth and Society: Rights and Responsibilities" Constitutional Rights Foundation/Chicago Project.

"Students and Schools: Rights and Responsibilities" State of Illinois, Office of Education.

Learning Packet Booklet - Law Project
Workshop Packet Booklet - Law Project

Resource Materials:

It should be noted that there are many printed and audiovisual materials that are not essential to the operation of the program but that the teacher may find helpful in implementing specific program

content. Local newspapers and free publications from various legal and community agencies may be available. A resource list will be provided at the first inservice session.

Replication Costs

Classroom Materials Program materials including texts, manuals, teacher guides and test materials.	$1,000
Supplementary A-V Materials and Simulation Games	300
Office Supplies It is expected that the school have normal supplies, however, additional masters and duplicating paper would be desirable.	300
Teacher-Training-Five-5 hour inservice days	
Payment for substitutes or stipends for teachers Maximum	250
Teacher travel money - Maximum	150
TOTAL COST	$2,000

It is strongly recommended that the teacher be given some released preparation time to coordinate program components and/or some clerical assistance.

Special Problems

For full implementation of the program, it is necessary for the school administration to allow for some flexibility so that workshops may be conducted, peer and cross-age teaching schedules may be designed, field experiences may be arranged and resource persons may be invited to participate in the program.

Since contacts must be made with resource persons and law and community agencies, a telephone should be made available for teacher and/or student use or clerical assistance should be provided.

Coorperation of the school administration and staff, community and parental support and involvement can help to alleviate problems that may result from the full implementation of program components.